is reasonable. It says, first of all, don't spend more money than you're going to raise before 1981 as we told you to. You only get that mill levy up to 1981 as we told you to. You only get that mill levy up to 1981 and don't overexpend it and, secondly, if you want to build a new one, take it to the people, just like the public schools do. Now I can't understand, Mr. President, why there would be objections to that. I think that's fair, right and reasonable. I made a commitment and those who were there will remember it, to the Post-Secondary Advisory Committee when I said at some point in time we're going to talk about limitation of capital construction for Community Colleges. I spoke to a member of the Metro Board who happens to live in my district, a close friend of mine, yesterday and I said, do you have any problems with the way we've got it situated now with the three campus situation in Omaha? Absolutely no problems. I said, are you ever intended to build more than three campuses? She says, not as long as I'm on the board, and if we decide to we can take it to a vote of the people. So it appears to me that the logic is not there Senator Barnett, as to how this destroys the Community Colleges, how this makes it state controlled as I understand the Cullan-Marvel amendment and I want to ask Senator Marvel a question. Senator Marvel, does basically your amendment say, first of all, you cannot expend money more than you have provided by legislative authority and secondly, does it say if you want to build a new campus, that you have to go to a vote of the people?

SENATOR MARVEL: Right.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Is that the thrust of the amenment? Then I defy anyone to tell me how that destroys the state of the local control or how it has an adverse effect on Community Colleges. I oppose the Barnett motion.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: The Chair recognizes Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY: Mr. President, and colleagues, I support the kill motion on 922 and make these few brief remarks regarding my support for this kill motion. LB 922 attacks straight out capital construction in Technical Community Colleges and those monies are entirely property tax money on the local area put on there by the locally elected board and has not one dime of state monies, sales tax money or income tax money involved in the capital construction funds whatsoever. If we want to set out straight out, direct, let's do it, but the roundabouts method that are contained in 922 are very obvious and should be opposed. What's the direct approach? Enter a bill for the state to take over the Technical Community College system supported entirely by sales tax and income tax funding and know that we have a state system. We have a situation here as an example where the State of Nebraska is flat out directing property tax use in the Technical Community College system. This is unacceptable and we know that it is. Senator Frank Lewis says let's do it just like the public school system does. Okay. The public school system in Grand Island, Nebraska, which operates under state law has for the last thirty years had a four mill levy fund for construction where it's a pay as you go proposition. Every year we pay four mills into the construction fund and as we need new schools, as we need to remodel schools, expand schools,